1	Brian C. Rocca, S.B. #221576	Glenn D. Pomerantz, S.B. #112503	
2	brian.rocca@morganlewis.com Sujal J. Shah, S.B. #215230	glenn.pomerantz@mto.com Kuruvilla Olasa, S.B. #281509	
3	sujal.shah@morganlewis.com Michelle Park Chiu, S.B. #248421	kuruvilla.olasa@mto.com MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP	
	michelle.chiu@morganlewis.com	350 South Grand Avenue, Fiftieth Floor	
4	Minna Lo Naranjo, S.B. #259005 minna.naranjo@morganlewis.com	Los Angeles, California 90071 Telephone: (213) 683-9100	
5	Rishi P. Satia, S.B. #301958	• , , ,	
6	rishi.satia@morganlewis.com MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP	Kyle W. Mach, S.B. #282090 kyle.mach@mto.com	
7	One Market, Spear Street Tower	Justin P. Raphael, S.B. #292380	
7	San Francisco, CA 94105 Telephone: (415) 442-1000	justin.raphael@mto.com Emily C. Curran-Huberty, S.B. #293065	
8		emily.curran-huberty@mto.com	
9	Richard S. Taffet, <i>pro hac vice</i> richard.taffet@morganlewis.com	MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP 560 Mission Street, Twenty Seventh Floor	
	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP	San Francisco, California 94105	
10	101 Park Avenue	Telephone: (415) 512-4000	
11	New York, NY 10178	Ionathan I Vravia nya haa waa	
11	Telephone: (212) 309-6000	Jonathan I. Kravis, <i>pro hac vice</i> jonathan.kravis@mto.com	
12	Ian Simmons, pro hac vice	MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP	
	isimmons@omm.com	601 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Suite 500E	
13	Benjamin G. Bradshaw, S.B. #189925	Washington, D.C. 20001	
	bbradshaw@omm.com	Telephone: (202) 220-1100	
14	O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP	5 1117 5 W 6 5 W 6 5 0 6	
1.5	1625 Eye Street, NW	Daniel M. Petrocelli, S.B. #97802	
15	Washington, DC 20006 Telephone: (202) 383-5300	dpetrocelli@omm.com	
16	Telephone. (202) 383-3300	Stephen J. McIntyre, S.B. #274481 smcintyre@omm.com	
10	Attorneys for Defendants	O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP	
17		1999 Avenue of the Stars	
		Los Angeles, California 90067	
18		Telephone: (310) 553-6700	
10			
19	LINITED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT	
20	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT	
20	NORTHERN DISTR	CICT OF CALIFORNIA	
21			
	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
22			
23	IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE	Case No. 3:21-md-02981-JD	
23	ANTITRUST LITIGATION	Case 10. 3.21-1110-02/01-3D	
24		DEFENDANTS' FIRST AMENDED	
	THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:	ANSWERS AND DEFENSES TO	
25		STATE OF UTAH ET AL.'S FIRST	
26	State of Utah et al. v. Google LLC et al., Case No. 3:21-cy-05227-JD	AMENDED COMPLAINT	
۷۵	110. 5.21-CY-05227- JD	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	
27			
28			

3

2

4 5

6 7

9 10

8

12

11

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

23

24

25

26

27 28 INTRODUCTION

Defendants Google LLC, Google Ireland Limited, Google Commerce Ltd., Google Asia Pacific Pte Ltd., Alphabet Inc., and Google Payment Corp. (collectively "Google") answer Plaintiff States' First Amended Complaint, through its undersigned counsel, as set forth below.

Android, Google's open-source mobile operating system ("OS"), is a critical source of competition against other operating systems. This competition has brought tremendous benefits to developers and users. By providing Android to smartphone manufacturers for free, Google LLC has expanded access to smartphones and the marketplace for mobile apps, creating enormous incentives for developers to invest in apps that make virtually every sector of the economy more efficient, affordable and accessible for users. These benefits have typically come at little or no cost to smartphone manufacturers, developers or users. Google's app store, Google Play, which works on Android, created an innovative channel for the distribution and use of software apps, and a leading source of critical competition to Apple's iOS ecosystem and App Store. Android and Google Play have been widely embraced not because of anticompetitive conduct, but because users and developers prefer Google Play when given a choice among Android app stores and distribution channels. Android device manufacturers can choose to pre-install their own or thirdparty app stores on Android devices, right alongside Google Play, and over 60% of Android devices come with more than one app store pre-installed. And Android users are free to download apps and app stores directly from the Internet; millions do so every day.

Far from generating anticompetitive harm, Android and Google Play bring enormous benefits to developers and users—and they do so at zero cost to users and minimal cost to developers, including the States, in the vast majority of cases. Plaintiff States' suit threatens to undermine, rather than enhance, the very competition that has brought these benefits, and harm the same consumers the States purport to represent.

RESPONSE TO NUMBERED PARAGRAPHS

The section headings in the First Amended Complaint do not require a response. To the extent that the section headings contain allegations requiring a response, Google denies all such allegations.

to bring claims under Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act and under state law.

the quoted documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.

LLC acquired the Android mobile operating system in 2005 and that Android is an open

ecosystem that, at its core, has always been about openness, and respectfully refers the Court to

defendants receive a payment for in-app purchases with respect to apps distributed through Google

developers, including discoverability made possible by distribution, e-learning opportunities, free

Play, and charges up to 30% as a service fee. Google avers that Google provides benefits to

Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 1, except admits that Plaintiffs purport

Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 2, except Google admits that Google

Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 3, except admits that one or more

1.

2.

3.

4

7

12

11

10

13 14

15 16

17

1819

2021

22

2324

2526

27

28

- tools for developers to effectively build apps for Android devices, testing and monitoring tools, and a global digital payment infrastructure to enable developers to transact with users using the most effective payment methods regardless of where the developers or users are located. Google
- Google further avers that beginning on January 1, 2018, the service fee on subscriptions with respect to apps distributed through Google Play was reduced from 30% to 15% for subscriptions retained after 1 year, and beginning on January 1, 2022, the service fee on subscriptions with

further avers that Google has enabled developers to create revenue streams for themselves.

Google further avers that beginning on July 1, 2021, the service fee was reduced to 15% for the first \$1 million of revenue on digital goods or services every developer earns each year.

respect to apps distributed through Google Play will be 15% from day 1 of the subscription.

- 4. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 4.
- 5. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 5, except admits that Google users use Google Play Billing for in-app purchases with respect to apps distributed through Google Play with some exceptions, including purchasing physical goods and purchasing digital content elsewhere that is consumed within the app.
- 6. Google admits the allegations in Paragraph 6, except that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in the last three sentences.
 - 7. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 7.

8. 1 Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 8. 9. 2 Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 9. 3 10. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 10. 4 11. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 11, except admits that Google Play 5 Billing is required for in-app purchases of digital content on apps distributed through the Google 6 Play Store, and admits that in-app purchases of physical products do not require Google Play 7 Billing. 8 12. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 12. 9 13. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 13. 14. 10 Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 14. 15. 11 Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 15. 12 16. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 16. 13 17. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 17. 14 18. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 18. 15 19. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 19, except admits that the "direct 16 downloading of apps and app stores" is sometimes called "sideloading," and avers that multiple 17 app stores and access points to apps exist, as users can and do multi-home in accessing apps. 18 20. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 20. 19 21. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 21. 20 22. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 22. 21 23. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 23, except admits that Google users use 22 Google Play Billing for purchases through Google Play with some exceptions, including 23 purchasing physical goods and purchasing digital content elsewhere that is consumed within the 24 app. 25 24. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 24. 25. 26 Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 25. 27 26. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 26.

- 27. The allegations in Paragraph 27 are legal conclusions not subject to admission or denial. To the extent a response is required, Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 27.
- 28. The allegations in Paragraph 28 are legal conclusions not subject to admission or denial. To the extent a response is required, Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 28.
 - 29. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 29.
 - 30. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 30.
- 31. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 31 except admits that mobile device manufacturers, wireless carriers, and app developers utilize Android and distribute apps and that tens of millions of consumers choose Android-based smartphones in the United States.
 - 32. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 32.
 - 33. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 33.
- 34. The allegations in Paragraph 34 consist of Plaintiffs' characterizations of their purported claims and legal conclusions not subject to admission or denial and to which no response is required. To the extent any response is required, Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 34.
- 35. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 35, except admits that Google LLC is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware with its principal place of business in Mountain View, California, and that Google LLC is a party to the Google Play Developer Distribution Agreement ("DDA"). Google further admits that Google LLC is a subsidiary of XXVI Holdings Inc., which is a Delaware corporation and a subsidiary of Alphabet Inc. Google further admits that Alphabet Inc. is a publicly traded company that is incorporated and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware and that maintains its principal executive offices in Mountain View, California. Google further admits that its products and services include Android OS, Chrome, Gmail, Drive, Maps, Google Play, Search YouTube, Google Cloud, and Search Ads 360.
- 36. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 36, except admits that Google Ireland Limited is organized under the laws of Ireland with its principal place of business in Dublin, Ireland, is a subsidiary of Google LLC, and is a party to the DDA.

- 37. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 37, except admits that Google Commerce Ltd. is organized under the laws of Ireland with its principal place of business in Dublin, Ireland and is a party to the DDA.
- 38. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 38, except admits that Google Asia Pacific Pte. Ltd. is organized under the laws of Singapore with its principal place of business in Mapletree Business City, Singapore, and is a party to the DDA.
- 39. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 39, except admits that Google Payment Corp. is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Mountain View, California and is a subsidiary of Google LLC.
- 40. Google denies the allegations of Paragraph 40, except admits that Alphabet Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Mountain View, California.
- 41. The allegations in the first sentence in Paragraph 41 are legal conclusions not subject to admission or denial. To the extent a response is required, Google does not dispute subject matter jurisdiction. Google admits the allegations in the second sentence in Paragraph 41.
- 42. The allegations in Paragraph 42 are legal conclusions not subject to admission or denial. To the extent a response is required, Google does not dispute—for purposes of this action only—personal jurisdiction of this Court or the venue of this action.
- 43. The allegations in Paragraph 43 are legal conclusions not subject to admission or denial. To the extent a response is required, Google does not dispute—for purposes of this action only—the venue of this action.
 - 44. Google admits the allegations in Paragraph 44.
 - 45. Google admits the allegations in Paragraph 45.
- 46. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 46, except admits the allegations in the first and last sentences.
 - 47. Google admits the allegations in Paragraph 47.
- 48. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 48, except admits that original equipment manufacturers ("OEMs") frequently pre-install an OS on each mobile device.

1	and avers that multiple app stores and access points to apps exist, as users can and do multi-home		
2	in accessing apps.		
3	65.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 65.	
4	66.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 66, and avers that evidence shows that	
5	users can and	do switch and multi-home among and between mobile and nonmobile ecosystems,	
6	including between Android and iOS.		
7	67.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 67.	
8	68.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 68.	
9	69.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 69, and respectfully refers the Court to	
10	the cited document for a complete and accurate statement of its contents.		
11	70.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 70.	
12	71.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 71.	
13	72.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 72.	
14	73.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 73.	
15	74.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 74.	
16	75.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 75.	
17	76.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 76.	
18	77.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 77, and respectfully refers the Court to	
19	the cited doc	uments for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.	
20	78.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 78, except admits that consumers can	
21	download apps on Android devices from competing app stores or through sideloading.		
22	79.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 79.	
23	80.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 80.	
24	81.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 81.	
25	82.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 82.	
26	83.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 83, except that Google admits that	
27	Google LLC owns Android OS.		

- 84. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 84, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited document for a complete and accurate statement of its contents.
- 85. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 85, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 86. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 86, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 87. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 87, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 88. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 88, except that Google is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 88 about what Amazon has said.
- 89. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 89, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 90. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 90, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 91. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 91, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 92. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 92, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 93. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 93, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
 - 94. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 94.
- 95. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 95, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 96. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 96, except admits that Android 12 includes modifications related to third-party app stores and that in certain instances sideloaded apps do not automatically update in the background on the Android OS. Google is without

knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 96 about what Amazon has said.

- 97. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 97.
- 98. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 98, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 99. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 99, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 100. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 100, except admits that Aptoide was flagged as "harmful."
- 101. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 101, except that Google admits the existence of Portuguese litigation involving Aptoide, and that Google is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in the first sentence about the findings of the purported "independent study."
- 102. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 102, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
 - 103. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 103.
 - 104. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 104.
- 105. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 105, except admits that one or more defendants have entered into agreements with OEMs and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 106. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 106, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 107. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 107, except admits that developers are generally required to enter into the DDA to distribute apps through Google Play. Google further admits that DDA, Section 4.5 states, "You may not use Google Play to distribute or make available any Product that has a purpose that facilitates the distribution of software applications and games for use on Android devices outside of Google Play." Google respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.

- 108. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 108, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 109. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 109, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 110. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 110, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
 - 111. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 111.
- 112. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 112, except admits that one or more defendants offer an App Campaigns program, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
 - 113. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 113.
- 114. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 114, except admits that one or more defendants have agreements called Mobile Application and Distribution Agreements ("MADAs") and optional Revenue Share Agreements ("RSAs") with some OEM and mobile network operator ("MNO") partners, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 115. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 115, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited document for a complete and accurate statement of its contents.
- 116. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 116, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents. Google admits that mobile manufacturers have a choice whether to enter into a MADA to distribute devices with proprietary Google apps, including the Google Play Store, and that these agreements contain various provisions regarding placement of certain Google apps for the initial out-of-the-box settings, though the specific terms have changed over time.
 - 117. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 117.
- 118. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 118, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.

- 119. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 119, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 120. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 120, except admits that one or more defendants offer Google Play Services, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
 - 121. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 121.
- 122. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 122, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 123. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 123, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 124. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 124, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 125. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 125, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 126. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 126, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 127. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 127, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 128. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 128, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
 - 129. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 129.
- 130. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 130, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 131. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 131, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 132. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 132, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.

- 133. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 133, except admits that one or more defendants have revenue sharing agreements with OEMs and MNOs, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 134. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 134, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 135. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 135, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 136. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 136, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 137. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 137, except that Google is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 137 about Samsung's products and operations.
- 138. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 138, except that Google is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 138 about Samsung's products and operations.
- 139. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 139, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 140. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 140, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 141. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 141, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 142. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 142, except that Google is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 142 regarding Samsung's calculation of its revenue, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 143. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 143, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.

Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 160.

28

160.

- 1			
1	purchasing physical goods and purchasing digital content elsewhere that is consumed within the		
2	app.		
3	176.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 176.	
4	177.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 177.	
5	178.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 178.	
6	179.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 179.	
7	180.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 180.	
8	181.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 181.	
9	182.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 182.	
10	183.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 183.	
11	184.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 184.	
12	185.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 185.	
13	186.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 186.	
14	187.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 187, and respectfully refers the Court to	
15	the cited docu	aments for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.	
16	188.	Google admits the allegations in Paragraph 188.	
17	189.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 189.	
18	190.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 190 except admits that one or more	
19	defendants ea	rn revenues from the Play Store.	
20	191.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 191.	
21	192.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 192.	
22	193.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 193, and respectfully refers the Court to	
23	the cited docu	ament for a complete and accurate statement of its contents.	
24	194.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 194, and respectfully refers the Court to	
25	the cited document for a complete and accurate statement of its contents.		
26	195.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 195, except admits that one or more	
27	defendants or	perate the Chrome Web Store and that the Chrome Web Store faces competition.	

- 232. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 232, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 233. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 233, except admits that Google looks out for users' best interests, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
 - 234. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 234.
 - 235. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 235.
- 236. Google admits that in 2008, one or more defendants launched Android Market. Google admits the remaining allegations of Paragraph 236, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 237. Google denies the allegations of Paragraph 237, except admits that one or more defendants have agreements with OEMs and MNOs, and is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 237 about the bargaining power of OEMs and MNOs.
- 238. Google denies the allegations of Paragraph 238, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited document for a complete and accurate statement of its contents.
- 239. Google admits that Android is an "opensource platform" that is "available for anyone to view, download, modify, enhance, and redistribute," and respectfully refers the Court to the cited document for a complete and accurate statement of its contents.
 - 240. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 240.
- 241. Google denies the allegations of Paragraph 241, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
- 242. Google denies the allegations of Paragraph 242, and respectfully refers the Court to the cited document for a complete and accurate statement of its contents.
- 243. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 243 and respectfully refers the Court to the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents.
 - 244. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 244.
 - 245. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 245.

246. 1 Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 246, except admits that one or more 2 defendants launched the Google Play Store in 2012. 3 247. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 247. 248. 4 Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 248. 5 249. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 249, and respectfully refers the Court to 6 the cited documents for a complete and accurate statement of their contents. 7 250. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 250. 8 251. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 251, and respectfully refers the Court to 9 the cited documents for a complete and accurate description of their contents. 10 252. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 252. 253. 11 Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 253. 12 254. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 254. 13 255. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 255. 14 256. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 256. 15 257. Google reasserts and hereby incorporates by reference its responses to each 16 Paragraph of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, as though fully set forth herein. 17 258. The allegations in Paragraph 258 are legal conclusions not subject to admission or 18 denial. To the extent a response is required, Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 258. 19 259. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 259. 20 260. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 260. 21 261. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 261. 22 262. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 262, except admits that it engages in 23 interstate commerce. 24 263. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 263. 25 264. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 264. 265. 26 Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 265. 27 266. Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 266.

- 1			
1		306.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 306.
2		307.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 307.
3		308.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 308.
4		309.	Google reasserts and hereby incorporates by reference its responses to each
5	Paragra	ph of F	Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, as though fully set forth herein.
6		310.	The allegations in Paragraph 310 are legal conclusions not subject to admission or
7	denial.	To the	extent a response is required, Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 310.
8		311.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 311, except admits that one or more
9	defenda	ants hav	we entered into agreements with app developers.
10		312.	Google admits the existence of the documents referenced in Paragraph 312 and
11	respect	fully re	fers the Court to the referenced documents for a complete and accurate statement of
12	their co	ontents.	
13		313.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 313.
14		314.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 314, except admits that it engages in
15	intersta	te com	merce.
16		315.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 315.
17		316.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 316.
18		317.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 317.
19		318.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 318.
20		319.	Google reasserts and hereby incorporates by reference its responses to each
21	Paragra	ph of I	Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, as though fully set forth herein.
22		320.	The allegations in Paragraph 320 are legal conclusions not subject to admission or
23	denial.	To the	extent a response is required, Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 320.
24		321.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 321.
25		322.	Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 322, except admits that one or more
26	defenda	ants hav	ve entered into agreements with developers.
27			
28			

denial. To the extent a response is required, Google denies the allegations in Paragraph 339.

Case No. 3:21-cv-05227-JD

- 1			
1	Third Defense		
2	(Relief Contrary to Public Interest, Inequitable, Impractical, and Unworkable)		
3	The relief sought by Plaintiffs would be contrary to the public interest, harm consumers,		
4	and is otherwise inequitable, impractical, and unworkable.		
5	Fourth Defense		
6	(Lack of Parens Patriae Standing)		
7	Plaintiffs lack standing to bring parens patriae claims under federal and state law.		
8	<u>Fifth Defense</u>		
9	(No Parens Patriae Authority)		
10	Plaintiffs' parens patriae state law claims are barred in whole or in part because state law		
11	does not authorize such claims.		
12	Sixth Defense		
13	(Failure to Join an Indispensable Party)		
14	The First Amended Complaint fails to join necessary and indispensable parties, including,		
15	but not limited to, consumers and developers of apps distributed for free on Google Play.		
16	Seventh Defense		
17	(Foreign Trade Antitrust Improvements Act)		
18	Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the Foreign Trade Antitrust		
19	Improvements Act, 15 U.S.C. § 6a, insofar as Plaintiffs make claims concerning transactions or		
20	alleged conduct involving trade or commerce with foreign nations outside U.S. jurisdiction.		
21	Eighth Defense		
22	(Mitigation of Damages)		
23	Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, by their failure to mitigate damages, if		
24	any.		
25	Ninth Defense		
26	(Noerr-Pennington Doctrine)		
27	Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the <i>Noerr-Pennington</i> doctrine.		
28			
- 1	1		

Tenth Defense 1 2 (International Comity) 3 Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of international comity, insofar as Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief affecting transactions and conduct occurring outside U.S. 4 5 jurisdiction. **Eleventh Defense** 6 7 (Failure to Comply with State Notice Requirements) 8 Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, by failure to comply with pre-suit notice 9 requirements under state law. 10 **Twelfth Defense** (Statute of Limitations) 11 12 Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part by the statute of limitations applicable to 13 their respective claims. 14 **Thirteenth Defense** 15 (Dormant Commerce Clause) Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part by the Dormant Commerce Clause. 16 17 **RESERVATION OF DEFENSES** 18 Google reserves the right to assert additional defenses when it determines the particulars of 19 Plaintiffs' claims, which are not apparent on the face of the First Amended Complaint. Google 20 reserves the right to amend this Answer to add, delete, or modify defenses based upon legal 21 theories that may be or will be divulged through clarification of Plaintiffs' First Amended 22 Complaint, through discovery, or through further legal analysis of Plaintiffs' position in this litigation. 23 24 **JURY DEMAND** Google demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable. 25 26 27 28

- 1		
1	Dated: March 31, 2022	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
2		Brian C. Rocca Richard S. Taffet
3		Sujal J. Shah Michelle Park Chiu
4		Minna Lo Naranjo Rishi P. Satia
5		Respectfully submitted,
6		By: /s/ Brian C. Rocca
7		Brian C. Rocca
8		O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP Ian Simmons
9		Daniel M. Petrocelli
10		Benjamin G. Bradshaw Stephen J. McIntyre
11		Respectfully submitted,
12		-
		By: <u>/s/ Ian Simmons</u> Ian Simmons
13		
14		MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP Glenn D. Pomerantz
15		Kuruvilla Olasa Kyle W. Mach
16		Justin P. Raphael
17		Emily C. Curran-Huberty Jonathan I. Kravis
18		Respectfully submitted,
19		By: /s/ Glenn D. Pomerantz
20		Glenn D. Pomerantz
21		Counsel for Defendants
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
20		
		O N 001 0

ECF ATTESTATION I hereby attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from each of the other signatories hereto. Dated: March 31, 2022 By: /s/ Kuruvilla Olasa Kuruvilla Olasa -40-